

1                                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2                                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3       EMMANUEL CABALLERO,

Case No.: 3:19-cv-00079-MMD-WGC

4                   Plaintiff

**Order**

5       v.

Re: ECF No. 230

6       ROMEO ARANAS, et. al.,

7                   Defendants

8                   Before the court is Defendants' motion for leave to file Exhibit 1 under seal in support of  
9       Defendants' response to Plaintiff's motion to strike counsel's spoliation of evidence. (ECF No.  
10       230.) Exhibit 1 contains Plaintiff's dental records.

11                   "Historically, courts have recognized a general right to inspect and copy public records  
12       and documents, including judicial records and documents." *Kamakana v. City and County of*  
13       *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).  
14       ""Throughout our history, the open courtroom has been a fundamental feature of the American  
15       judicial system. Basic principles have emerged to guide judicial discretion respecting public  
16       access to judicial proceedings. These principles apply as well to the determination of whether to  
17       permit access to information contained in court documents because court records often provide  
18       important, sometimes the only, bases or explanations for a court's decision."" *Oliner v.*  
19       *Kontrabecki*, 745 F.3d 1024, 1025 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*  
20       *v. F.T.C.*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1177 (6th Cir. 1983)).

21                   Documents that have been traditionally kept secret, including grand jury transcripts and  
22       warrant materials in a pre-indictment investigation, come within an exception to the general right  
23       of public access. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178. Otherwise, "a strong presumption in favor of

1 access is the starting point." *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). "The  
 2 presumption of access is 'based on the need for federal courts, although independent—indeed,  
 3 particularly because they are independent—to have a measure of accountability and for the  
 4 public to have confidence in the administration of justice.'" *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler*  
 5 *Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S.Ct. 38 (Oct. 3, 2016)  
 6 (quoting *United States v. Amodeo (Amodeo II)*, 71 F.3d 1044, 1048 (2nd Cir. 1995); *Valley*  
 7 *Broad Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct., D. Nev.*, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294 (9th Cir. 1986)).

8       There are two possible standards a party must address when it seeks to file a document  
 9 under seal: the compelling reasons standard or the good cause standard. *Center for Auto Safety*,  
 10 809 F.3d at 1096-97. Under the compelling reasons standard, "a court may seal records only  
 11 when it finds 'a compelling reason and articulate[s] the factual basis for its ruling, without  
 12 relying on hypothesis or conjecture.'" *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). The court must  
 13 "'conscientiously balance[ ] the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep  
 14 certain judicial records secret.'" *Id.* "What constitutes a 'compelling reason' is 'best left to the  
 15 sound discretion of the trial court.'" *Id.* (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Comm., Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599  
 16 (1978)). "Examples include when a court record might be used to 'gratify private spite or  
 17 promote public scandal,' to circulate 'libelous' statements, or 'as sources of business information  
 18 that might harm a litigant's competitive standing.'" *Id.*

19       The good cause standard, on the other hand, is the exception to public access that has  
 20 been typically applied to "sealed materials attached to a discovery motion unrelated to the merits  
 21 of the case." *Id.* (citation omitted). "The 'good cause language comes from Rule 26(c)(1), which  
 22 governs the issuance of protective orders in the discovery process: The court may, for good  
 23

1 cause, issue an order to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or  
2 undue burden or expense.'" *Id.*

3 The Ninth Circuit has clarified that the key in determining which standard to apply is  
4 whether the documents proposed for sealing accompany a motion that is "more than tangentially  
5 related to the merits of a case." *Center for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101. If that is the case, the  
6 compelling reasons standard is applied. If not, the good cause standard is applied.

7 Here, Defendants seek to file exhibits under seal in connection with their response to  
8 Plaintiff's motion to strike counsel's spoliation of evidence, which is only tangentially related to  
9 the merits of a case." Therefore, the good cause standard applies.

10 This court, and others within the Ninth Circuit, have recognized that the need to protect  
11 medical privacy qualifies as a "compelling reason" for sealing records. *See, e.g., San Ramon*  
12 *Regional Med. Ctr., Inc. v. Principal Life Ins. Co.*, 2011 WL89931, at \*n.1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10,  
13 2011); *Abbey v. Hawaii Employers Mut. Ins. Co.*, 2010 WL4715793, at \* 1-2 (D. HI. Nov. 15,  
14 2010); *G. v. Hawaii*, 2010 WL 267483, at \*1-2 (D.HI. June 25, 2010); *Wilkins v. Ahern*, 2010  
15 WL3755654 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2010); *Lombardi v. TriWest Healthcare Alliance Corp.*, 2009  
16 WL 1212170, at \* 1 (D.Ariz. May 4, 2009). This is because a person's medical records contain  
17 sensitive and private information about their health. While a plaintiff puts certain aspects of his  
18 medical condition at issue when he files an action alleging deliberate indifference to a serious  
19 medical need under the Eighth Amendment, that does not mean that the entirety of his medical  
20 records filed in connection with a motion (which frequently contain records that pertain to  
21 unrelated medical information) need be unnecessarily broadcast to the public. In other words, the  
22 plaintiff's interest in keeping his sensitive health information confidential outweighs the public's  
23

1 need for direct access to the medical records. Therefore, this would satisfy the good cause  
2 standard as well.

3 Here, the referenced exhibits contain Plaintiff's sensitive dental records. Balancing the  
4 need for the public's access to this information against the need to maintain the confidentiality of  
5 Plaintiff's medical records weighs in favor of sealing these exhibits. Therefore, Defendants'  
6 motion (ECF No. 230) is **GRANTED**.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: November 4, 2021

9 

10 William G. Cobb  
United States Magistrate Judge